

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexasofan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,929	08/31/2006	Meija Yang	ARS-121	1147
23557 SALIWANCH	7590 09/29/201 IIK LLOYD & SALIW.		EXAM	INER
A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION			BURKHART, MICHAEL D	
PO Box 14295 GAINESVILL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

euspto@slspatents.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/566,929	YANG, MEIJA	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Michael Burkhart	1633	

earned patent term adjustment.	See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	

	Michael Burkhart	1633			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	iress		
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA? Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3T CFR 1.38 and FS X; (6) MCNFTN from the mailing table of this communication. Failure to reply whith me set or ostended period for reply will by sets of the control of the contr	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	iction is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowand	e except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
 Claim(s) <u>23-37</u> is/are pending in the application. 					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	14				
8) Claim(s) <u>23-37</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept	oted or b) objected to by the l	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the dr	awing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correctio					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	miner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Applicati	on No			
Copies of the certified copies of the priorit	y documents have been receive	ed in this National S	Stage		
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	f the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	Interview Summary Poper Ne(s) Mail D	(PTO-413)			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (FTO/S3/00)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F				
Paper No(e) Mail Date	6) Other:				

1)	ш	Notice	Ç

Art Unit: 1633

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 23 (in part) and 24 - 35, drawn to a chimeric protein comprising a recycling domain and a domain binding an extracellular target, wherein the recycling domain is comprised of a deltaN-lactoferrin domain and a HFE α1α2 domain (i.e. an "RC1" recycling domain as set forth in the specification).

Group II, claim(s) 23 (in part) and 24 - 35, drawn to a chimeric protein comprising a recycling domain and a domain binding an extracellular target, wherein the recycling domain is comprised of a HFE $\alpha 1\alpha 2\alpha 3$ domain (i.e. an "RC2" recycling domain as set forth in the specification).

Group III, claim(s) 36, drawn to a composition comprising an isolated DNA molecule, an expression vector, a host cell transformed with the expression vector, purified preparations of a chimeric protein, a pharmaceutical composition comprising the protein, and a pharmaceutical composition comprising the host cell, all of the above either encoding or comprising a chimeric protein comprised of a recycling domain and a domain that binds an extracellular target.

Group IV, claim(s) 37, drawn to a method of preventing a disease by administering a chimeric protein or a host cell transformed with an expression vector encoding the chimeric protein to an individual, wherein the chimeric protein is comprised of a recycling domain and a domain that binds an extracellular target.

Art Unit: 1633

The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature linking Groups I - IV is a chimeric protein comprising a recycling domain and a domain binding an extracellular target as set forth in claim 1. However, Ehrlich et al (WO 02/24929, cited in the IDS dated 8/31/2006) disclose a fusion protein comprising the HFE α 1 α 2 an α 3 domains, which comprise an endocytosis domain (α 1 α 2) and an exocytosis domain (α 3) and bind to the transferring receptor according to the instant claims and specification. The HFE domains are fused to β -2 microglobulin, which is considered to bind to an extracellular therapeutic target (it regulates iron levels) and the chimeric protein itself is soluble, i.e. extracellular, and binds the transferring receptor. In addition, the chimeric protein may be bound to any given therapeutic (claims 1 and 2 of Ehrlich et al). In particular see pages 5 -6, ¶s[0037] and [0075] of Ehrlich et al.

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of Groups I - IV does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art.

The technical feature of Group I is considered to be a chimeric protein comprising a recycling domain and a domain binding an extracellular target, wherein the recycling domain is comprised of a deltaN-lactoferrin domain and a HFE $\alpha 1\alpha 2$ domain (i.e. an "RC1" recycling domain as set forth in the specification).

The technical feature of Group II is considered to be a chimeric protein comprising a recycling domain and a domain binding an extracellular target, wherein the recycling domain is comprised of a HFE $\alpha 1\alpha 2\alpha 3$ domain (i.e. an "RC2" recycling domain as set forth in the specification).

Art Unit: 1633

The special technical feature of Group III is considered to be the combination of all the different compositions recited in claim 36, which appear to all have to be present in order to satisfy the claim limitations.

The special technical feature of Group IV is considered to be a method of preventing a disease by administering a chimeric protein or a host cell transformed with an expression vector encoding the chimeric protein to an individual, wherein the chimeric protein is comprised of a recycling domain and a domain that binds an extracellular target.

Accordingly, Groups I-IV are not so linked by the same concept or a corresponding technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Species Election I, Groups I or II, choose one type of protein domain binding an extracellular target, e.g. as recited in claims 31 - 33 (the various SEQ ID NOs encode VEGF (claim 31), TNF (claim 32) or IL-18 (claim 33) as domains binding an extracellular target), and indicate which claims the selection reads on, i.e. claims 27 and 28;

Species Election II (Group IV), choose one type of compound to be administered, either the chimeric protein or the host cell.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify

Art Unit: 1633

the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowed generic claim. Currently, the following claim(s) are generic: for species election I, claims 23 - 28 appear to be generic; whereas for species election II, claim 37 is generic.

REQUIREMENT FOR UNITY OF INVENTION

As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(a), a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in a national stage application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim. See 37 CFR 1.475(e).

Art Unit: 1633

WHEN CLAIMS ARE DIRECTED TO MULTIPLE CATEGORIES OF INVENTIONS

As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(b), a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:

- (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) A product and process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

Otherwise, unity of invention might not be present. See 37 CFR 1.475(c).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of

Art Unit: 1633

election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof. Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper

Art Unit: 1633

restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Burkhart whose telephone number is (571)272-2915. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on (571) 272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Burkhart/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633